

Meeting Description: Michigan Geographic Framework Users Meeting

Date: October 8, 2004

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Location: Michigan Center for Geographic Information, George W. Romney Building, 10th Floor, Conference Room

I. Approval of Meeting Minutes

II. Geographic Framework Program

A. Version 4 on Web

Everett Root, Center for Geographic Information (CGI), reported Version 4b shape files are on the web and a message was sent Michigan GIS Users Group yesterday. It is the same products you are use to seeing – different shape file themes all zipped up ready for download with data dictionary and metadata. Everything in Version 4a is in Version 4b.

B. Act 51 Process

Everett Root, CGI, reported Act 51 roads are being added – the county roads and changes are nearly in, changes for cities and villages are flowing from the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT). Staffs who have not started on cities and villages yet are working on repositioning for the counties who did not pass the Census Bureau TIGER Improvement Program accuracy. The Act 51 roads and annexations are the focus. The changes can vary per county. The corrections come in on a sheet, 10 per sheet, and there may be 10-100 sheets per county. Some counties made extensive use of maps that were sent last year, which had framework as base and highlighted non-county-owned roads and highlighted road that status is unsure. Some counties have done a lot of work to clarify.

Gordon Rector, U. S. Census Bureau, asked if they are roads that are no longer in existence or were never there to begin with.

Everett Root, CGI, responded that it is a combination of both. A lot are dead-end roads that are not there any more.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented originally on Act 51 they put in platted subdivisions and platted roads some were never built but they were not required to take them out.

Everett Root, CGI, added that the changes throughout the state are hit or miss. The City of Detroit returned 9 sheets with comments and annotations. CGI was working with map from 1970 and this may be the first time changes had been made since then.

Bill Enslin, MSU, assumed that in Version 4b work on railroads and school districts was not finalized at that time.

Everett Root, CGI, responded that rail was pretty close and school districts were not. Version 5 will be next July. There will be a GIS release before the Version 5 release. There is not a plan for a formal release but they can extract. They can pull a layer at any time.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that CGI is working on a process to cut dated Versions at any point during the year. But they are not there yet. Rob's sense is that they will probably come out with Version 5 release and then start working on it. Staff is working in the new line identification (LID) process, which is a companion to the physical referencing (PR) system. There are other requirements that forced CGI to do additional programming with another identification system. The system is being built to be able to create a version of state file base map at any time. If CGI is going to partner if with folks it will be hard to wait entire year for a new release. That is what is pushing this design development. But can get a GIS file at any time.

Bill Enslin, MSU, stated that he gets questions about what is coming on next. Will some of the drains be a part of Version 5?

Rob Surber, CGI, responded the CGI has acquired either drain networks or other source materials for most of the counties in southeast Michigan. CGI is underway with the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) process. The cut off is usually the end of March for the release in May. They have done corrections to the line work as well as adding new information that was not in the Michigan Resource Information System (MIRIS) files. So are quite a few new drainage features.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, asked if CGI has moved over resources to put in new roads that are submitted by the counties for the Qualified Voter Files (QVF) private roads.

Everett Root, CGI, responded that some are in.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that they have met with the Department of State (DOS) and that project will kick into high gear after the elections. CGI has a tight time frame – in the next couple of years have to get everything online. The road commissions have been asking how to get information back to CGI. CGI is working with the County Road Association of Michigan (CRAM) to get that info back to CGI maybe through products like RoadSoft.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, asked if there is a way to put it on the QVF change sheet with a flag for Act 51 changes. The Road Commission is going to decertify a series of roads.

Everett Root, CGI, stated that it has to be submitted through the Act 51 process. CGI cannot touch a certification attribute.

C. Digital Ortho Update

Sherm Hollander, Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) reported that everything is up on the web. Production work was completed earlier in the year. Finally have statewide coverage from the color infrared National Aerial Photography Program (NAPP) imagery.

D. Partnership Update

Ann Burns, SEMCOG, reported they are doing a spring 2005 flight for 7 counties in southeast Michigan. They are beginning contract negotiations with Earthdata. The partners need to discuss data sharing agreements and a 3-tier approach to ownership and re-distribution of data. The counties can redistribute 6-inch resolution of data, SEMCOG can redistribute 1-foot resolution, and the state can redistribute 2-foot resolution. The quality control committee is to develop standards. The county will do quality control their portion and the regional partners might pitch in if a county needs assistance. They will develop a tool or work with the vendor's tool to create some standards and documentation makes sure that everybody on the same page. They plan for delivery before the end of the year. It is all digital, true color and black and white. The partners have the option to purchase color infrared on their own. SEMCOG is not coordinating any additional products. They are getting the digital surface model and the counties will be able to sell or give away. Each partner will get this for internal use but will not be able to distribute it. It is a reflective digital surface model.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, reported Woolpert delivered their data early August. It has been distributed to 3 townships and will send another 3 next week. There are 8 units of local government helped purchase data, but all are entitled to it. Now the question is how to do that. Only 8 have software capable of viewing so have to find a software solution. The Map Image Viewer (MIV) is probably a key vehicle and along with that goes training.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, commented they are remosaicing theirs to MIV. A Quarters of their townships don't even have a hall much less a computer. She is making hardcopies for them.

Jim Living, Woolpert LLP, commented that it was a 3 county (Ottawa, Allegan, Barry) venture. Ottawa flew lidar also. They are going to produce contours but they will process them. If anyone in the county wants to purchase them, they can.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, commented that Allegan County has 24 local units of government – 24 townships and 10 cities and villages. To have all get on board and share the cost brought it way down. For the next acquisition in 2-3 years, they want to solicit utility companies that go through the county. If that is worked into a percentage scale with each additional interested party it will reduce everyone's cost overall. The elevation model went into the ortho rectification and that was the county's contribution along with the coordination and dissemination of data.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, stated that it helped having the 3 counties bid but 3 different contacts. It allowed Ottawa to get more.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, added that the counties shared the cost of getting the plane in the air, on site and doing the ground survey. But each county can do its own thing.

Rob Surber, CGI, said that he would like to capture essence of the model because there are counties that are interested in this approach.

Ann Burns, SEMCOG, commented that they had one neighboring county approach SEMCOG and wanted to join in.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, added that it worked well to have split contracts because there is the base minimum that all agree on and each county can deal with any extras they may want separately.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, added this works if vendors can provide all the options.

Ann Burns, SEMCOG, commented that it seems like a good idea because all parties do not have to agree on one product. SEMCOG people all came to an agreement on one product, but some people might be getting a little more than they need.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, asked if FSA flew their full color 2-meter.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded it will be summer of 2005. They will fly. The question is if there are enough partners and enough dollars. There is a lot of machinery nationally and it can't be changed on a dime. The interest of the state is to maximize what is out there and reduce duplication. They will fly 2-meter and with partnership will fly 1-meter.

Everett Root, CGI, added that they will only do leaf on, 2-meter in counties that have a certain amount of agriculture.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, stated that it helps to group counties by where they are in GIS development and where their state equalized value (SEV) is and how much money they have. Barry and Allegan had similar requirements but Ottawa had more SEV and they were able to get something a little better.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, added that it doesn't lock you into the 3 county things because next time, it might be Allegan, Ottawa, and Van Buren Counties.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented the state is interested in looking at ways to partner and in providing more incentive for locals to partner. The state will up the percentage if there are more partners because there is less coordination and less paperwork. The state is trying to synthesize across departments to agree on standard products, what is the budget, and can they come to some series of products and look at a timeframe. There will always be deadlines for imagery needs. Beyond that there are common requirements across state departments. In the past, Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) and Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) have had budgets for this and other departments have had to scrounge enough money at any given time and it has not been well coordinated. But the state is working on a plan to do that, but why stop at the state. Why not continue to encourage multi-county, multi-jurisdictional relationships, but we need a little flexibility. The state will have to ensure the state departments will not be agreeing to something that will not give full coverage of the state. The question is can timelines and requirements be aligned. Can people adjust to the idea that a certain part of the state be flown every 4th year and the money that would have been spent for off-year flights or so

other product, etc. They are looking at it from an opportunity standpoint. Open to working on partnership that will help everybody's budgets. If CGI can work to capture essence of lessons learned and best practices, that can be taken to other parts of the state as part of a way to do this.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, commented having a 2-year wind up will guarantee that will not compete with other projects. Your project will be the one the vendor is working on. The larger the group, the higher priority you are.

Jim Living, Woolpert, added that Tri-County has Request for Purchase (RFP) on the street right now. Ingham County has one that will be process within 3-4 months and they will have their color digital.

E. School District Map Products

Rob Surber, CGI, reported there has been a big an activity to create school district maps for the state.

Everett Root, CGI, added it is part of the boundary review process. Promised all school districts that if they reviewed and corrected their boundaries, CGI would provide them with a hard copy of their school district. Some of the school districts responded that their boundary looks fine. Maps will be mailed to school districts, PDFs will go on the CGI web site, will be available for download, and additional copies will be printed for a fee. Everett displayed an Eaton Intermediate School District (ISD) map with all school district buildings that are in the database, cities, villages, townships, roads, and hydrology. CGI is using the ESRI Map Book product. The tool is great – were able to make a map for every school district in the state within a matter of minutes. The PDF process takes time. They have a labeled roads layer statewide. The x/y school geography shows up in Points of Interest layer in Map Michigan. The school district layer will be in Version 5, but can get a copy now if needed. Made the maps out of the geodatabase that has been edited. Township and cities have been ordering more maps. If there are changes, they can make change on hard copy, send back to CGI to make the changes, and they will print a new map. Many school contacts were transportation directors, secretaries, and IT people because the review was done via the internet with the Rockford map behind it.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that the reality is that when there are partnerships, there are various levels of capabilities. CGI expects these maps will be highly used.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, stated that there is a process to change an address to another school district - have to have agreement on both sides and approval by the State Board of Education.

Everett Root, CGI, added that the Schools of Choice has reduced the need for that. The maps will be mailed soon. The PDFs will be on the server and when they are all there, they will be made public. They are part of the vignette web portal for the State of Michigan. Will put on the "What's New" on CGI web site.

John Esch, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), asked if there is more activity for geocoding the roads layer since Version 4.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that where there are 911 conversions, there has been a lot addresses adding that will be available in Version 5.

Everett Root, CGI, added that are a lot of roads that have been added to Version 4 but they do not have addresses.

III. Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Projects and Activities

Sherm Hollander, MDNR, reported all the ortho work done for the Michigan contract has gone through the USGS review and been validated by USGS. It is available through the national database.

IV. Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) Projects and Activities

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported MDOT is using framework to collect data for the Asset Management Council on all federal aid roads in Michigan the second time around. They have completed 4-5 trunkline pavement condition rating systems and are bringing them to the map. Those will show up shortly on the Transportation Asset Mapping System (TRAMS) web application. This data has never been mapable because everyone had their own referencing system when they collected pavement data. MDOT will not guarantee the old data.

Rob Surber, CGI, added at the MiCAMP session where Gil Chesbro, MDOT, presented on the data collection activities at MDOT using global positioning system (GPS), it was very useful and it will become more a way people will use framework to collect data. The process of GPS is going to be refined but it is already a pretty good process. Get the benefit of having a real-world location but can also get a spatial location that can be linked to everything else. That will be the process of using other data from other programs that are collect by GPS but referencing it to the same point. MDOT is a big data producer and all their data has not been in one location on the map before.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that MDOT is sending files to local agencies that that try to get back traffic data – number of vehicles per day on various roads. MDOT has an extensive count for the trunkline system to report on federal aid roads. Currently the best source is the 1980s Needs Study where the local agencies sent their information into MDOT. They used gross factors and Federal Highways is not happy that MDOT is still using 1980 data. MDOT is going to send samples to planning regions to have them collect data on sections of roadway that are representative for the whole state. MDOT did put Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) data on those roads and must update 2-3 years. The rest of the roads that are not sampled, MDOT uses the 1980 data. They need a better estimate of traffic. The map will be a way they can feed it back into the system. Through the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS), traffic counts are coded as an attribute in framework. But beyond the federal aid system comes from the Needs file and it is old data.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, commented that the county is looking at traffic crash mapping and using the AADT to figure if it is above or below average depending on the distribution of traffic.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, added they want this for master planning purposes.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated they hope to get data back on the higher-level roads. For non-federal aid roads is group them together by type and area of the state and averaged out what was in the Needs file. In 1-2 years, they will come back to the same regional contacts and ask for a better estimate. MDOT will be sending out current HPMS as a starting point.

Rob Surber, CGI, asked if Joyce had list of contacts so Valdis can see who gets the data in Allegan County.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, responded that she could get the list.

Rob Surber, CGI, added the counties that use RoadSoft will also be able to start work with the data. That is a mixed bag as to who is using it and how they are using it.

John Esch, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), stated folks in the Air Quality Division always ask if there is road traffic info available because the need it for air quality monitoring.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, added that this data may not be good but the best available. Can incorporate it into the business cycle and as MDOT's data improves it will keep getting better.

V. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Projects and Activities

John Esch, MDEQ, reported the good news is that MDEQ has a MDEQ geographic information system (GIS) committee with upper management direction. The goal is to coordinate projects with CGI and MSU and work globally and eliminate duplication. There is meeting tomorrow to talk about MDEQ's opinion on aerial imagery partnership, leaf on/leaf off, pixel size, etc. MDEQ also hopes to establish internet map application for all program areas and hope there is funding to work with CGI. There is a need for MDEQ internally and also for the public to provide locations of cleanup sites, landfill sites, and jump sites.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that things CGI develops for other state departments will be reused for MDEQ so to reuse the state dollars as much as possible.

John Esch, MDEQ, commented the start of a proposal to digitize bathometric contours and Michigan State Industries (MSI) is currently working on this. MDEQ can use this information. Just found out that CGI has georeferenced and digitized 600 or so of those. The folks who work in Lakes can use the original georeferenced TIF images. In the future, projects that overlap with MDEQ, please contact them.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that he will continue to try to let people know of the projects.

John Esch, MDEQ, commented that half of the images that nobody thought would be of use are deleted or gone, but there is use in that.

Dave Slayton, MDEQ, reported they have been trying to map historic county, township, farmer landfills across the state. There is an effort going on in southeast Michigan to do the same thing. There are over 1,000 mapped and they are going through a process to refine to put a polygon on the map that represents the degree of accuracy. Would like to get the map out there for people to get revisions to them. MDEQ sent letters in the mid90s to townships and local health departments and asked for their input. MDEQ is mapping responses to the best of their ability. It is important especially in southeast Michigan because they are building subdivisions on or next to landfills and some are having methane problems. People are not aware they are there and they need this information.

John Esch, MDEQ, added MDEQ has 6-7,000 factories and clean-up sites that they are working on locations for.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that CGI is meeting with MDEQ about an application. That will be a very useful data set.

Dave Slayton, MDEQ, added there are a lot of deed restrictions and drinking water restrictions that they are also trying to map.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, suggested that there is a county GIS coordinating entity, they work with the townships and know who they are and also have access to the local health departments.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, commented that if MDEQ has a site of a factory, the county would have building x/y or have air photos to locate building x/y. Rosemary worked with an EPA grant for Allegan and Kalamazoo counties locating building x/y for Superfund sites. It is a lot easier now that they have the information.

Dave Slayton, MDEQ, added there is a lot of duplication going on. Is there a list of counties with GIS system?

Rob Surber, CGI, recommended MDEQ work with CGI because they have a list of counties for establishing partnership networks.

Dave Slayton, MDEQ, clarified that once they get their map completed, they should contact CGI.

Everett Root, CGI, added that their first request came out over the GIS Users List. A lot of county GIS people are on that list.

Dave Slayton, MDEQ, stated if he does this, he wants to do the entire state.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, commented 53 of the 83 Michigan counties have some GIS activity. Some are through the Equalization Department and they may be able to channel it in the right direction.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that even though it may not be the county GIS office that ultimately fills the request, they are trying to encourage role of GIS coordination through state to local processes. This gives them an opportunity to strengthen ties and ultimately will help the state. But there are places that are not interested.

Rob Surber, CGI, mentioned that he has been in touch with Steve Miller who is working at MSU and MDEQ and he has asked to present the ground water mapping work. He will speak next month about aquifer and other projects related. MDEQ now has a GIS Coordination Group. Twelve GIS projects have MDNR executive approval to work on. Rob will share the list at the next meeting so there is not duplication of efforts.

Everett Root, CGI, added the drinking water wells are available on the Geographic Data Library in the Geology Section and are updated every 2 weeks on a MDEQ server.

VI. Michigan State Police (MSP) Projects and Activities

A. Michigan Homeland Security GIS Advisory Committee

Rob Surber, CGI, reported the results of the Homeland Security GIS Advisory Committee survey assessments to see how GIS ready our communities that have standup responsibility are in the event of an emergency. There are 111 communities times 2. The committee is trying to identify the emergency operation manager and GIS office in these communities or in groups who support this function. Rob distributed maps and asked the group if they are in an area of the state where you see it isn't returned, please follow up to get the information to CGI. There are a number of maps that will be put on the CGI web site. The biggest push now is getting the Homeland Security Community to embrace the GIS community. If you look at the literature and conferences, the EOC community believes they are embracing GIS technology but Rob is not sure they know what it means to embrace the community. It is one thing to have a piece of software and some tools but it is another for the long-term relationship to understand how to sustain something like this. Homeland security dollars are going to dry up. So how do we keep this going and ensure that the right people and the right mix of tools, data, and information continues. They are trying to break down paradigms. You don't know what the need is going to be but you need people and understanding of what they can do. There has to be an understanding of this for the long-term. The final report will be available on the web. One recommendation will be to get a simple tool that all can use. How to get there is yet to be determined. It establishes a network of mutual aid agreements that talk about fire and police. It is the traditional resources that are available but not GIS. They are now trying to focus on mutual aid and what it takes to sustain it. Some people think that GIS can be turned on and it will go. There needs to be some simple tools. Sometimes data is a hard nut to crack and the maintenance and currentness of information. The EOC folks think a certain way about emergencies and are not thinking about technology the GIS folks do. That is a big part of the education that is needed.

Ann Burns, SEMCOG, stated that their Standards Committee is talking standards of GIS data and how to share data between counties in case an emergency.

Rob Surber, CGI, added the final report will go to the governor's Homeland Security Council. It will be a specific recommendation. And they want the governor's council to actually read it. There will be a lot of education included as well.

John Esch, MDEQ, asked if updated imagery is a factor of homeland security.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded there is minimum data layer list. That will be in there but it is not going to be the first thing they see. The emergency operations community can pigeonhole technology as data. They need to see GIS data as important as fire and police and are a valuable part of the team.

Charley Hickman, United State Geological Survey (USGS), commented that MSP E-team got an award from National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO).

VII. Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH) Projects and Activities
Nobody present.

VIII. Michigan State Industries (MSI) Projects and Activities

Chuck Bender, MSI, reported they are finishing the Right-of-Way Project. Will zipping up and emailing to MDOT mailing tomorrow. They are georeferencing the maps and providing TIFs for a backdrop. MSI has 52 counties yet to do. The As Built Project is an ongoing process. MSI has another 17 lakes to finish for the MDNR project.

IX. CGI Projects and Activities

A. Michigan Mall

Rob Surber, CGI, reported there is a new service called the Michigan Mall online to purchase state information – books, publications, MDNR products and there is one Department of State product on there which potentially opens it up for other state agencies to use. The URL is Michigan.gov/michiganmall. It is for all state agencies. CGI has a lot of products on the web, but they are working on a process to make products available for purchase.

Everett Root, CGI, added that this allows for payment collection by credit card. It is an opportunity to make things more efficient. This is a service not a moneymaker.

X. MSU Remote Sensing and GIS Research and Outreach Services Projects and Activities

Bill Enslin, MSU, reported the Remote Sensing and GIS at MSU is physically moving to the Psychology Research Building which will be renamed the Geography Building. They will still have Remote Sensing training lab on the 2nd Floor. The lab will have built-in projectors and will be more modern. Archives are moving with it and will be relegated to the basement. There will be some advantages for geography. This has been on the books for 20 years. Remote Sensing is under the Department of Geography now. Bill's unit will be separate but will have their own servers and lab within that operation.

John Esch, MDEQ, stated that everybody want to get updated imagery. At the first MDEQ GIS committee meeting people wanted old stuff. In some program areas it might be more valuable to use 1972, 1965, or 50' aerial and get them georeferenced, which must be a huge monumental task.

Bill Enslin, MSU, added there is georeferenced stuff in the archive and there is an effort to scan it all. It is county by county. MSU has most years of Ingham County have been scanned. There is the old LandScan format because there is a tool in the Map Image Viewer (MIV) where they can click on a location to bring up a checklist of historic photos that are available for that site and can then click which ones they want to see. The archives uses the MIV and it is built into the version MDEQ has and also built in pro-version being marketed through Bill's company. It will be available through a purchase through MSU. Bill was trying to encourage web service for on-demand.

Ann Burns, SEMCOG, stated that SEMCOG just acquired older imagery from the Detroit Edison. They are in JPG and not georeferenced. SEMCOG is thinking of putting a couple of interns on it but it is not high priority.

Jim Living, Woolpert LLP, commented that Oakland County their last contract before Woolpert and scanned in their old stuff.

Charley Hickman, USGS, said at the last framework meeting Jeroen Wagendorp mentioned that Western Michigan University (WMU) was scanning old maps.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, added WMU has a large archive of old photos including the 1930 series for the region.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, commented that Jeroen was talking about a project by WMU to purchase a set of scanners and take them on a road trip to the National Library of Congress and scan in old historical maps they have and produce a vehicle to make available on the web.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that a pointer system to various sources would be very useful. It is worth continuing this discussion but it comes down to priorities and time.

XI. County/Local Projects and Activities

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, reported they are suffering the onslaught of requests for new aerial photos. They have 17 units of government and 8 of them were there the first week.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, reported they are looking for data for PA116 Farm Land Preservation Lands. The state has a database and he got an extract within a couple days of the request. It is a list in an excel spreadsheet with legal descriptions.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, added it was missing approximately 50% of the properties when Barry County did a data pull 5 years ago.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that he thinks that system in dBase. It is not a tightly designed system.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, stated the money that is being paid out to people other than the PA166 list.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that is known. CGI was working on pilot projects and it is a lot of work, but where does the funding come from to clean it up.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, added they are working on Transfer/Development Rights and part of the criteria required to be partially funded is a PA116. If the state cannot provide good PA11 list then why are they requesting the PA116 information within ½ mile of the property being included within the subdivision.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated the Department of Agriculture (DOA) is setting up a GIS committee that is similar to MDEQ and MDNR. Steve Halstead, State Veterinarian, has been given the authority to do that and is also working on the Homeland Security stuff since they have a lot of issues in that area. If you have issues working with Ag, send them to Steve. It is an internal prioritization and planning process to get better direction for their programs.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, stated they are looking for National Pipeline System dataset. Not sure of the quality of the data, but local, state, or federal government agency can request by letter on official letterhead with a disclaimer that you will not distribute data, send to United State Department of Transportation and they will send data in ESRI shape files.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that before 9-11, CGI was asked to serve as lead to coordinate the compilation of that information. They were getting ready to cut the check but the program was cancelled because of 9-11 and it all went to the federal level and the states were out of the picture. Rob is interested to know what Valdis finds out.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, added that is relies on voluntary submission.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that CGI was going to work with Public Service Commission.

James Munro, St. Clair County, reported they issued a Request for Purchase (RFP) for drafting parcels; the base GIS layer will be their tax parcel. They plan to draft the entire county over the next three years. Their emergency operations center (EOC) has a number of things going on. They are in the final phases of the schools project. Not only have they located all the schools but have obtained the building school plans and digitized into a GIS format. They are finalizing the project by taking pictures and have a web site to interact with the plans so they can identify hazardous materials, gas and electrical shutoffs, and all things that first responders need to be entrusted in. The county is working with the Michigan State Police (MSP) E-Team to kick off training in the near future. They are also exploring the possibilities of damage assessment capabilities. They have a consultant from Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to discuss rapid damage assessment and see what they can do with the E-Team software. The county is exploring workflow changes to get updated framework data. They just did a computer-aided dispatch and realize there are address problems between their Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) and road address information. James is looking at coordinating the clerks and the parcel people and the road commission.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, added that their county also looked at dispatch for 911 and transportation. It looks like initially they will not be able to use framework and will have to use GDT for addressing and use theirs as a cross check.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, stated that it is an important part of getting it into framework at all. They started sending local updates while Version 3b was ripe and are now cranking on Version 5 and those updates have not been made at all. Even the new stuff coming fully attributed and submitted digitally is not in there. This is disappointing and frustrating.

James Munro, St. Clair County, added they are exploring the possibility for next year of increasing the address and point information by utilizing the existing asset management of roads. They are already driving a car down roads down St. County roads using a global position system (GPS) and doing road inventory and they may be able to drive slower can click GPS points at driveways. They did asset inventory this year and know it will take will take x number of dollars to do St. Clair County and will inject more money to drive roads.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that CGI is kicking around the idea of creating a master point address file for the state to support state business independent of the ranges they are working on – not unlike what the Census Bureau has. The U.S. Postal Service and Census Bureau do both – range base editing and a point file rural areas.

Gordon Rector, US Census Bureau, clarified it is an address point where there is a post office deliver and the Census Bureau went out to map spot that address to make sure that address got in the right block.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated CGI is considering is creating a point file for every address point in the state.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County LIS, commented that is what Allegan County is doing now. They have just over 10,000 point addresses in now by using the parcel property addresses.

Rob Surber, CGI, added CGI would not be focusing on the parcels. But the interface would be the actual point that would identify addressable sites.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, commented use the center of the parcel to create the point then move the point to the house when you have a digital ortho.

Rob Surber, Allegan County LIS, added this is not a federal framework sort of layer, but CGI is kicking around the idea that this would become a framework layer within the state.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County LIS, stated that GDT will buy that layer.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated the issue is that the state is running up against the fact that this information is needed for the Department of Treasury and the Department of State, Department of Labor and Economic Growth, and Indian lands. It is not unlike Census Bureau - need better

information. CGI is calling it the Centralize Address Point System (CAPS) project. This could support the Qualified Voter File (QVF) in a different way than the range basis because it deals with individual addresses. Most people don't deal with ranges - they deal with individual addresses. CGI is struggling with the stewardship component. The idea is that it would be a unique identifier with x/y and all the systems that need it in state government would have the ID. CGI would manage the relationships.

XII. Regional Projects and Activities

Ann Burns, SEMCOG, reported they are working on the geodatabase migration with SDE. They are streamlining their process for when they take delivery of the framework. They are working with Model Builder in Version 9. They are working on metadata standardization. They are reevaluating the regional meetings to make more technical and less formal. Made a presentation to the group and members want something different, so they are back to the drawing board with limited resources. They meet quarterly. They want the meetings to be worthwhile.

XIII. Federal Projects and Activities

Gordon Rector, United States Census Bureau, reported the Census Bureau is looking to pilot with several states to cleanup and streamlines the process by which they gather the boundary information for townships, cities, and townships. Will have an internal conference call this month and then will come to Lansing to meet with CGI and other interested parties in November. This will be a good thing because the Census Bureau spends money and time surveying individual entities about boundary changes. Would like to get with state level people to track down the changes.

Everett Root, CGI, stated CGI sent list of changes as of January 1, 2004 and they all fit on one page.

Rob Surber, CGI, added they are hoping to talk about digital exchange.

Charley Hickman, USGS, distributed handouts - Guidelines from Federal Geographic Data Committee, which is a revised version of guidelines of what geospatial data is safe to put on the web. The comments are online. The second handout is regarding standards, which are out for review. The layers being reviewed are elevation, bathymetry, hydrography, cadastral, transportation, governmental units, and digital ortho photos. The Ohio GIS conference was last week and one of the keynote speakers was from National Emergency Number Association (NENA). He brought up the use voice over IP and the challenge to find the location when they get calls that way. The National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC) meeting and Michigan did 2 presentations - Framework and Homeland GIS Security. Michigan can influence the feds. Eric Swanson, CGI, was in a meeting with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

XIV. Other Issues

John Esch, MDEQ, stated there is a cool way to put GIS data into a power point presentation - unfreeze.com, which is a free animated GIF and can stick it into a power point.

XV. Next Meeting Date

November 4, 2004, 10 a.m. until 12 p.m., Michigan Center for Geographic Information, George W. Romney Building, 111 S. Capitol, 10th Floor, Lansing, MI 48933